

Please cancel Claim 2.

5. (Amended) A fuel composition according to Claim 1, which [has been] is compacted.

Please cancel Claim 6.

7. (Amended) The fuel composition according to Claim 1 wherein the organic chemical is a copolymer of sodium [acryrlate] acrylate and acrylamide.

9. (Amended) The synthetic fuel composition according to Claim 1, wherein [at least] about 90% of the particle [sizes] of the coal dust are 50 microns or less.

11. (Amended) They synthetic fuel composition according to Claim 10, where the functionalized starch is one or more polysaccharide resins consisting of a solution of a polysaccharide having a dextrose equipment between 0.1 and 100 wherein the polysaccharide has been chemically modified [selected from the group consisting of Lorama starches JK270, JA250, JA250-3, ECOPlus, and ECO].

12. (Amended) A method of making a synthetic fuel composition, comprising:
mixing at least about 90 wt. % of coal dust with water and with one or more organic chemicals selected from the group consisting of functionalized starches, copolymers of sodium acrylates and acrylamide and mixtures thereof reactive with said coal dust to form a composition; and
compacting the composition; thereby forming the synthetic fuel composition.

13. (Amended) The method of Claim 12 wherein [at least] about 90 [wt.] % of the particle [sizes] of the coal dust is 50 microns or less.

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

Please amend the specification as follows: On page 11, second from last full paragraph add in the last line after "other devices" –including a pug mill--.

REMARKS

Objection to Specification

Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice to satisfy the procedural objection made by the examiner on page 2 of the Official Action.

Claim 13 has been amended to resolve the error discussed by the examiner in paragraph 3 of the Official Action. Also the specification has been amended by inserting in the specification the "pug mill" phrase as proposed by the examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

The examiner is correct that the listing of patents in the specification is not a substitution for the submission of a PTO. The art discussed in the specification was only intended to give the examiner the general background of the invention.

Section 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 5 and 7 have been amended as proposed by the examiner – Claim 6 has been cancelled as explained below.

Claim 11 has been amended to eliminate reference to trademarks. The specific chemical description for the trademarked products involved has been substituted – see page 9 and 10 in the specification for the description.